UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/538,689	06/10/2005	Kouichiro Inomata	052684	6764
	7590 04/28/200 I, HATTORI, DANIEL		EXAMINER	
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW			INGHAM, JOHN C	
	SUITE 700 WASHINGTON, DC 20036		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2814	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/538,689	INOMATA ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	JOHN C. INGHAM	2814			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 Ja	action is non-final.				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 10 June 2005 is/are: a)	vn from consideration. r election requirement. r.	by the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the correction Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	4) ☐ Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) ☐ Notice of Informal P	nte			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/14/08</u> . 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/538,689 Page 2

Art Unit: 2814

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 14 January 2008 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. Claims **1-20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by EP 1 085 586, hereinafter the '586 Pub.

Regarding claims **1-5**, the '586 Pub discloses in Fig 10 a spin injection device comprising a spin injection part having a spin polarization part (102 antiferromagnetic layer fixes the spin of layer 103) capable of tunnel junction (¶62), and an injection junction part (104, nonmagnetic insulating layer), an SyAF (105) having a first magnetic layer (105a) and a second magnetic layer (105c) having different magnitudes of magnetization (¶58-59, thickness of free magnetic layers is different), and magnetically

Application/Control Number: 10/538,689

Art Unit: 2814

coupled together antiparallel to each other (¶64) via a nonmagnetic layer (105b), wherein: said first magnetic layer of SyAF and said junction part are bonded (105a and 104 are bonded).

Page 3

- 4. The claim language "a spin polarization electron is injected from said spin injection part by flowing electric current between said spin polarizing part and said second magnetic layer, and magnetization of said first and second magnetic layers is reversed while maintained in antiparallel state without applying an external magnetic field" describes an intended use of the claimed structure. Intended use and other types of functional language must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. In re Casey,152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); In re Otto , 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). In this case, the structure set forth by the '586 Pub meets the claimed structural limitations.
- 5. Regarding claim **6**, the '568 Pub discloses in Fig 36 the device of claim 1, wherein the aspect ratio (T1/W and T2/W, ¶194) of the first and second magnetic layers of SyAf in contact with the injection junction part is less than 2.
- 6. Regarding claim **7**, the '586 Pub discloses in Fig 10 a spin injection magnetic apparatus comprising a free layer (105) having a first and second magnetic layer (105a and 105c) coupled together magnetically antiparallel to each other via a nonmagnetic layer (105b), and in which magnitudes of magnetization are different (¶58-59, thickness

Application/Control Number: 10/538,689

Page 4

Art Unit: 2814

of free magnetic layers is different), and the magnetization of said first and second magnetic layer is capable of magnetization reversal while maintaining the antiparallel state (¶64), and a ferromagnetic fixed layer (103) tunnel-junctioned (¶62) with the first magnetic layer (105a) said free layer via an insulating layer (104), wherein said ferromagnetic fixed layer and said free layer are made to be a ferromagnetic spin tunnel junction.

- 7. The claim language "the magnetization of said first and second magnetic layers is reversed by flowing electric current between said second magnetic layer of the free layer and said ferromagnetic fixed layer while maintained in antiparallel state without applying an external magnetic field" describes an intended use of the claimed structure. Intended use and other types of functional language must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. In re Casey,152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); In re Otto , 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). In this case, the structure set forth by the '586 Pub meets the claimed structural limitations.
- 8. Regarding claims **8-12**, the '586 Pub discloses in Fig 10 the apparatus of claim 7, provided with a spin injection part (102 antiferromagnetic layer fixes spin of ferromagnetic layer 103) having an injection junction part (104, nonmagnetic insulating

layer) connected to said free layer (105, ¶58) and a spin polarization part (102, capable of tunnel junction ¶62).

- 9. Regarding claim **13**, the '568 Pub discloses in Fig 36 the device of claim 7, wherein the aspect ratio (T1/W and T2/W, ¶194) of the first and second magnetic layers of SyAf in contact with the injection junction part is less than 2.
- 10. Regarding claim **14**, the '568 Pub discloses in Fig 7 the apparatus wherein said spin injection part (71) may be a word line.
- 11. Regarding claims **15-18**, the '568 Pub discloses in Fig 10 a spin injection device comprising: a spin injection part having a spin polarization part (102) including a ferromagnetic fixed layer (103) and an injection junction part (104) of a nonmagnetic layer, and a ferromagnetic free layer (105 made of Co or Co alloy, ¶40) provided in contact with said spin injection part, wherein: said nonmagnetic layer of the injection junction part is made of an insulator (dielectric, ¶63), a nonmagnetic layer (106 made of Ru and 0.5 to 2.5nm thick ¶41) and a ferromagnetic fixed layer (107 of Co or Co alloy ¶40) is provided on the surface of said ferromagnetic free layer.
- 12. The claim language "the magnetization of said ferromagnetic free layer is reversed by flowing electric current between the spin polarization part and said nonmagnetic layer provided on the surface of said ferromagnetic free layer in the direction perpendicular to the film surface without applying an external magnetic field" describes an intended use of the claimed structure. Intended use and other types of functional language must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention

and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. In re Casey,152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); In re Otto, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). In this case, the structure set forth by the '586 Pub meets the claimed structural limitations.

13. Regarding claims **19 and 20**, the '568 Pub discloses in Fig 9 a magnetic apparatus (memory device) using the spin injection device of claim 17.

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments filed 1 June 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding the argument on page 10 that Inomata does not specify that the magnitudes of the magnetization of the first and second magnetic layers are different from one another, Inomata (¶58) discloses that the layers may be of different thicknesses, which creates a different magnitude of the magnetic layers in accordance with the instant specification. Paragraph 47 of the instant specification recites "in order to make difference in the magnitude of antiparallel magnetizations of the magnetic layers, t_1M_1 and t_2M_2 may be different". Therefore, magnitude of magnetization can be changed by a structural change of different thicknesses. As stated on page 10 of the arguments, magnitude can be changed by application of current, but that property is an intended use and not a structural limitation. Intended use and other types of functional language must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the

Art Unit: 2814

prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. In re Casey,152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); In re Otto, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOHN C. INGHAM whose telephone number is (571)272-8793. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wael Fahmy can be reached on (571) 272-1705. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/538,689 Page 8

Art Unit: 2814

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Howard Weiss/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 2814 John C Ingham Examiner Art Unit 2814

/J. C. I./ Examiner, Art Unit 2814